

Another New Manuscript of Sir John Davies's Epigrams

Lockwood, Thomas

DOI:

[10.1093/res/hgw066](https://doi.org/10.1093/res/hgw066)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Lockwood, T 2016, 'Another New Manuscript of Sir John Davies's *Epigrams*', *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 67, no. 282, pp. 875-896. <https://doi.org/10.1093/res/hgw066>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced version of an article accepted for publication in *The Review of English Studies* following peer review. The version of record Tom Lockwood, Another New Manuscript of Sir John Davies's *Epigrams*, *The Review of English Studies*, Volume 67, Issue 282, November 2016, Pages 875–896 is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/res/hgw066>.

Eligibility for repository: Checked on 10/5/2016

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Another New Manuscript of Sir John Davies's *Epigrams*

ANOTHER NEW MANUSCRIPT OF SIR JOHN DAVIES'S *EPIGRAMS*

BY TOM LOCKWOOD

Abstract

This article presents evidence for associating a new manuscript of Sir John Davies's *Epigrams*, now in the Hampshire Record Office, with the Hampshire gentleman, Sir Richard Paulet (c.1558-1614). It explores the transcription of the poem sequence to document the different scribes involved in the production of the manuscript, and to explore its place within our understanding of the transmission, and transmissional networks, of Davies's writing. The manuscript can be associated with the Middle Temple, and so (I argue) is a privileged if in many respects faulty witness to the very earliest circulation and transmission of Davies's *Epigrams*. The discovery of this and other 'new' manuscripts of Davies's very varied works, I suggest, extend new opportunities in the coming years for a new edition of his generically varied *Works*.

Text

For the two decades or so between the early 1950s and the early 1970s, reports of new manuscripts of Sir John Davies became a semi-regular occurrence in the pages of *The Review of English Studies*. Together with what is still the standard edition of *The Poems*, edited for the Clarendon Press by Robert Krueger with assistance from Ruby Nemser and published in 1975, those articles established the basis for modern textual scholarship on Davies in manuscript and print. This article explores that foundation so as to introduce and to contextualise a new manuscript witness to Davies's *Epigrams*: Jervoise of Herriard Collection, Hampshire Record Office (HRO) 44M69/M4/4. The manuscript, which contains transcripts of 33 epigrams by Davies, is found today in the papers of the Jervoise family of Herriard, on deposit at Hampshire

Record Office; the contents of the manuscript were first identified as Davies's work in 2000 by Steven May, and in 2013, at the same time as I was independently working on it, the manuscript was recorded by Peter Beal in his *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts* (as DaJ 8.5).¹ It has not before now been discussed in detail nor located fully within its archival context. Krueger assigned sigla to Davies manuscripts partly on the basis of their location and partly on the basis of their earliest owners, with *H* already employed; I will refer to the new manuscript explored here as the Herriard manuscript, and use Beal's DaJ 8.5 as its siglum.² This article, then, refreshes our understanding of Davies scholarship; describes in detail the Herriard manuscript as a newly recovered witness to his *Epigrams*; explores the possibility that it was owned by, and probably created for, Sir Richard Paulet (c.1558-1614), whose literary interests are well represented in the Jervoise family archive and are strongly associated with the Middle Temple; and finally it reflects on how this discovery, and others like it, might be central points of reference to inform a future edition, not only of Davies's *Poems* but of his discursively and generically varied *Works*. Together, this and other newly reported manuscripts signal a major expansion of the range of material available to Davies scholarship, and offer an opportunity to extend new ways of thinking about his writing into future research.

I

In 1952 *The Review of English Studies* published a short note by Percy Simpson, 'Unprinted Epigrams of Sir John Davies', and in doing so inaugurated the first serious period of sustained attention to Davies's writing since, from his Blackburn vicarage, the indefatigable Rev. Alexander Balloch Grosart produced not one but two editions of Davies in the later nineteenth century, first a three-volume *Works in Verse and Prose* (1869-76), and subsequently a two-volume *Complete Poems* (1876). 1952 was a momentous year for Simpson, marking the publication of the eleventh and final volume of the Oxford *Ben Jonson*, on which he had been at work, first in collaboration

with C.H. Herford and subsequently with Evelyn M. Simpson, since 1903.³ It may seem today that his *RES* note is a rather less distinguished witness than the *Jonson* to the life of extraordinary scholarship that Martin Butler has recently described, but in its confidence and its presuppositions it is strikingly of a piece with the larger achievement. Beginning in his argument as in his title from print, Simpson's note reports the then-current view that the two undated volumes of *Epigrammes and Elegies by I.D. and C.M.* had been printed 'probably in 1590'.⁴ It was not (in fact) until 1971 that a collaborative article in *The Library* by Roma Gill and Robert Krueger moved forward to straighten out the sequence and authority of these early editions, and firmly dated their publication to the mid- to late-1590s, and certainly no earlier than 1595.⁵ The two volumes were given the sigla *E1* and *E2* in Krueger's edition, and subsequently their distinction one from another was confirmed and (counter-intuitively) sequenced as STC 6350.5 and 6350 in the revised *Short Title Catalogue*.

In 1952, without the benefit of that later scholarship, Simpson clearly struggled to account for the textual evidence that his note reported from Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson poetry 212 (DaJ 5), and the sequence of 'English Epigrammes...by Iohn Davis of Grayes Inne' that it contains. These poems, Simpson wrote, were 'an earlier draft' of the printed sequence, and both something more and less also:

There are trivial variants in the manuscript text, none worth recording. But there are eight epigrams, which were not printed and which Davies evidently suppressed on revision. They have slight literary value and add nothing to his fame. The manuscript date of 1594 must be incorrect in view of the fact that they are the earlier copies.⁶

The brisk *hauteur* of this might well strike us today in the confidence of its allied critical and editorial judgement: the manuscript records only 'trivial variants...none worth recording' in texts

of ‘slight literary value’; and the manuscript evidence itself is dismissed with breezy disregard – ‘must be incorrect’ – in the face of a prior if anachronistic print assumption, which calls itself a ‘fact’. Rather than call into question the received dating, the evidence of the manuscript is discounted. The textual trajectory within which Simpson’s arguments unquestioningly locate themselves – from manuscript to print, and from earlier draft in manuscript to ‘mature work’ (as he calls it) in print – **also** shapes, we might note, his conception of Jonson as the poet of the 1616 folio, rather than the more varied and flexible writer between manuscript, print and the stage that today he now seems.

Simpson’s undoubted authority was only glancingly questioned in a letter to *Times Literary Supplement* at the end of the decade by R.F. Kennedy, who, in 1959, under very nearly the same title, **departed** from Simpson’s *RES* piece to point out that in fact Simpson had overlooked two further ‘Unprinted Epigrams by Davies’ in the Rawlinson manuscript, which his letter transcribed.⁷ Back in the pages of *RES*, James L. Sanderson reported in 1961 a new witness, MS 186 at what was then the Rosenbach Foundation Museum in Philadelphia, in a two-page note, ‘Unpublished Epigrams of Sir John Davies’ (the manuscript is now Rosenbach MS 1083/15; DaJ 9).⁸ The conceptual distance travelled between ‘Unprinted’ and ‘Unpublished’ may well be telling, for in Sanderson’s article publication has begun to mean something other than simply print publication, as it had **unquestioningly** for Simpson, so that manuscripts were becoming an object of study in their own right. Something even, perhaps, of their familiarity and unremarkableness might be apparent in the laconic, even casual title that Kennedy gave to a *RES* note of 1968, ‘Another Davies Manuscript’, reporting what is now Cambridge University Library, MS Kk.1.3(1) (DaJ 7).⁹

That titular tone of slightly disappointed additionality is testament to the work of one scholar, Robert Krueger, whose long, two-part *RES* article of 1962, ‘Sir John Davies: *Orchestra* complete,

Epigrams, Unpublished Poems’, gave Davies scholarship its modern form.¹⁰ Krueger’s later career as a Democratic Representative to the Ninety-fourth and Ninety-fifth Congresses of the United States, and the searing memoir he wrote with his wife of his service as a US Ambassador, *From Bloodshed to Hope in Burundi: Our Embassy Years During Genocide* (2007), have tended to obscure his focused but significant part in the institutionalisation and professionalisation of manuscript studies.¹¹ In a sequence of articles published as he completed his three-volume Oxford D.Phil. thesis, ‘A Critical Edition of the Poems of Sir John Davies’ (MS D.Phil. d.3241-3243), Krueger drew on a fine-grained codicological expertise to offer new accounts of manuscript and print interactions in early modern books.¹² In his *RES* article on Davies, Krueger drew again on what he identified and today is known as the Leweston Fitzjames [manuscript](#), Bodleian MS Add. B. 97 (DaJ 4), to offer an understanding of manuscript culture very different from that demonstrated by Percy Simpson only a decade earlier. Krueger confirmed Fitzjames’s identity and ownership of the manuscript by comparison with his signatures and annotations in two printed books, also in the Bodleian; he used biographical sources to construct a brief life, locating both men – Fitzjames and Davies – at the Middle Temple for a period after 1595 to provide a context for the manuscript; and he offered a detailed palaeographical account of transcription in the manuscript, and its relationship to the physical make-up of the bound volume and the five paperstocks from which it was compiled. In doing so, Krueger laid the ground work for his still-standard Oxford English Texts edition of *The Poems of Sir John Davies* (1975), a collaboration with Ruby Nemser, who had independently completed graduate work on Davies at Harvard under Douglas Bush.¹³ But more than that, as I want to suggest, Krueger established a framework and an approach through which the latest new [Herriard](#) Davies manuscript, HRO 44M69/M4/4, can be described and understood.

The Herriard manuscript has never formally been foliated, but must have first been constructed as a paper booklet of six bifolia, all taken from a single common paper stock and then nested together to form a 12-leaf gathering (1¹²). Its leaves measure c.202x143mm, though all have suffered some minimal damage or curling at their vertical outer edges. The chainlines in this paper run horizontally in the gathering, and their common watermark appears in the gutter. To the extent that the watermark can be pieced together in its different occurrences, it is a pot, bearing either the letters BO or BD; papers of this kind are very common, but to judge from the Gravell Watermark Archive less commonly used even very early in the seventeenth century than in the later sixteenth, to which years they are most commonly datable.¹⁴ The physical evidence of paper use in the manuscript supports a likely dating to the mid-1590s that makes good sense of its contents.

In the single gathering that first constituted the paper book, each nested bifolium was conjugate, one inside another, so that the outer leaves were conjugate (1.12), a pattern that continued inwards to the central leaves (6.7); the gathering was stab-stitched through that central conjugate fold, between folios 6 and 7, stitching that still holds the manuscript together today.¹⁵ As this description implies, the Herriard manuscript is not now quite in its first state, though its contents and the pattern of its use can with some certainty be reconstructed. With the ready-made paper booklet to hand, transcription began on what would have been fol. 1r of the booklet, beginning with the heading 'Epigrammata', and continued through to what would then have been fol.7r, at which point transcription stopped. The last line of verse transcribed is line 33 of Epigram 36, 'Of Tobacco', three lines from the poem's usual close. I will discuss that process of transcription later in more detail.

The manuscript's current form suggests that, once transcription had stopped, the remaining five blank leaves (fols 8-12 in the first foliation) were folded away from the reader and back around

the original stab-stitched spine of the booklet to its front. If the manuscript had then been refoliated without concern for its bibliographical structure, the text originally transcribed on fol.1r would then have been encountered as, apparently, beginning on fol.6r. Either at this point or later, four of the five leaves folded to the front of the booklet (fols 8-11 in the first foliation) were torn or more probably cut away to leave only their stubs still remaining, now curled together, one with another. As the manuscript survives today, what would have been fol.12v in the first foliation now appears as fol.1r, and serves the function of a protective wrapper for the manuscript's poetic contents; it bears in pencil the manuscript's former and current finding number, the earlier having been struck through. It is to this present-day structure that I will key my quotations and the discussion that follows, in which count the transcription of Davies's *Epigrams* occupies fols 2r-8r. In pencil also on fol. 1r is a tentative and now superseded attribution note, 'Geo. Puttenham', in the hand of Major F.H.T. Jervoise, who spent time with his family archive before its deposit at HRO in 1969.

Fol. 1 of the Herriard manuscript today carries what are two reasonably substantial early modern pen trials, the first – fourteen words across three lines of writing – *inverted* at the foot of what is now fol.1r and the second, also *inverted* and amounting to ten lines of verse, on fol. 1v. The relationship of the two pen trials to the transcription of Davies's *Epigrams* in the Herriard manuscript bear on the nature of that transcription, and for the relationship that this manuscript has to the larger archive of which it is part. The first pen trial, probably added last to the manuscript, is an associative list of nouns (see Figure 1):

Sand Flynt, earth, grasse, birds, River,
waves, brooke, ~~sands~~, fishe, ~~haue~~
dere, fawnes, hare

Scribe A, as I will describe the transcriber of these lines, writes a mixed hand, largely comprised of secretary graphs, which interchanges a strongly spurred and a spurless a-graph and a very open initial and terminal d-graph, usually lacking a lobe; both letter forms are found in the first word transcribed, ‘Sand’, where the initial capital S-graph is a little separated from the much more commonly transcribed letter string, *-and*, which makes up the word.

The second pen trial, now reversed on fol. 1v, if transcribed when the manuscript *gathering* was in its first state would originally have been written onto fol. 12r, *tucked away at the back of the booklet*. There are good reasons for thinking that this was the case, and that this pen trial was entered into the manuscript at the same period of use as the transcription of Davies’s *Epigrams*.

This longer pen trial is the work of a single scribe, Scribe B, who writes two hands: a set and rather round italic hand, with a slight rightwards slant and a noticeably flourished initial A-graph, marked by an umbrella-handled horizontal stroke balanced on its point; and a squarer and flatter, generally more upright secretary hand. Lines 1-4 and 7-10 are written in Scribe B’s italic hand, and lines 5-6, repeating the text transcribed in italic in lines 1-2, are written in Scribe B’s secretary hand (see Figure 2):

A *happi* change when mortall thinges
shall be eternised bi *immortallitie*
and so shall wee bee and if wee
doo not well in these thinges to bee

A happie change when mortal thinges 5
Shall be *æternised* by immortallitie

A hart I haue and a hart I craue and a

hart I hope to f find but from my

hart must departe and leaue my

hart be hinde for ye well ~~you~~ all

10

Below these ten lines of verse is a name, 'Iohn', in a fainter ink and a very cursive secretary hand, which is hard to associate with either of Scribe B's scripts on the page, or any of the other hands in the manuscript, and to which, accordingly, I will not assign a scribal identity.

Lines 7-10 in this transcript of the pen trial offer a new – if compressed, and re- or mislineated – account of a poem that May and Ringler record elsewhere as EV 370 in two manuscripts, the first of which they date to 1585 (Edinburgh, Laing III.467) and the second of which they date to c.1590 (Bodleian, Rawl. poet. 85).¹⁶ Like the lines that precede it, this poem mixes the language of devotional sentiment with a punning literariness, perhaps conventional in the *hart/heart/be hinde* wordplay of lines 7-10, but which is more striking in lines 1-4, which seem to be unique to this manuscript. These irregular lines have a memory of and rework two phrases from Edmund Spenser's *Amoretti*, 75: 'a mortal thing so to immortalize' and 'my verse your vertues rare shall eternize'.¹⁷ Spenser's sonnet is not known to have circulated in manuscript before the publication of *Amoretti and Epithalamion* in 1595, but there is evidence that at least one poem from the sequence did, Sonnet 8, so that as dating evidence these pen trials are suggestive of the mid-1590s if necessarily equivocal.¹⁸ But as evidence of a literary interest on the part of the main transcriber of the manuscript, and taken together with the dating of two other manuscripts of Davies's *Epigrams* – November 1594 for the transcript in DaJ 5, and 1595 for DaJ 4 – the pen trials connect chronologically, if not generically, with the main contents of the manuscript.

That these lines of verse are pen and hand trials is confirmed by the first page of transcription of Davies's *Epigrams* (fol. 2r; see Figure 2). Here Scribe B writes in the predominantly secretary

hand that was warmed up in lines 5-6 of the reversed transcriptions on fol. 1v, mixing with it some of the more markedly idiosyncratic of the italic letter forms also employed there, the initial capital A-graph balancing again its otiose cross stroke. Other continuities between the letter forms are clearly visible in the flourished medial h-graph, in which the closing stroke extends well under the graphs to the right that follow it, as it does in the terminal y-graph; and in the two-stroke medial r-graph, solid and detached, and with a heavy first stroke. This mixed, [hybrid version of Scribe B's two hands](#) is [used](#) for the majority of the transcription of Davies *Epigrams* save for a sequence of four poems across fols 4r-5r where a much narrower mixed hand, [written by Scribe C](#), takes over; [Scribe B](#) resumes lower down on fol. 5r and carries through the transcription [of the sequence](#) to its close (see Figure 3). [The hand written by Scribe C](#) is more cursive in appearance and is angled slightly to the right; the poems are transcribed with a little less attention to *mise-en-page* and spacing between stanzas, so that in the opening fol. 4v-fol. 5r the contrast between the hands is marked. Neither [scribe, to judge by their hands or their transcriptions](#), appears to be fully professional, nor likely to be familiar with the transcription of verse such as Davies's, as may be seen from a consideration first of the way in which the sequence of poems has been transcribed, and subsequently of the text of the poems in that sequence.

One telling example of [Scribe B's](#) effect as a copyist may be seen in a semi-diplomatic transcription of Epigram 10, 'In Medontem':

10. In Medontem

Great Captayne Medon wears a chaine of gold
 which at fue hundredth crownes is valued.
 for that it was his grand seires chaine of old

when great kinge henry Bulloigne conquered

And weare it medon ~~weares a chaine of gold~~

5

\that thou by virtue of this masie chaine/

~~which at fye hundreth~~ /a stronger towne\ then Bulloigne maist subdue

yf wise mens sawes be not reported vaine

For ~~which~~ \what/ said Phillipe kinge of macedon.

there is no Castelle so well fortified

10

but if an Assh laden ith gold come one

the gate will stoope and gates fly open wide

A number of different kinds of errors and inattention are evident within this short transcript, clustered in the second stanza but not confined to it. The eyeskip error that misconnected the medial ‘medon’ of lines 1 and 5 was not noticed by [Scribe B](#) until four words into what became line 7, for the duplicated reading ‘*which at fye hundreth*’ is still visible in large part underneath the overwritten text, ‘a stronger towne’. At some stage line 6, which had been omitted, was inserted as an interlineation between what are now lines 5 and 7, but at no point was the text of line 5 corrected, so that this transcript remains deficient. After the relatively small correction at the head of line 9, [Scribe B](#) evidently took more care with the layout of this poem, indenting lines 10-12. Yet notwithstanding the obvious errors of this text, it is important to note here for later return that one of the readings in this text – ‘reported’ (10.9) – is witnessed only in one other manuscript of the *Epigrams*. [The connection made by that variant](#) is with DaJ 4, the Leweston Fitzjames manuscript first identified by Krueger, and placed brilliantly by him at the Middle Temple as a witness very close to Davies no later than 1595.

It appears likely that the change from Scribe B to Scribe C in the transcription of the *Epigrams* manuscript is linked directly to the variable quality of the transcription at this point in the manuscript – the point, perhaps, at which Scribe B's repeated errors became unignorable (perhaps even by Scribe B). The 33 epigrams transcribed in the Herriard manuscript follow a sequence that substantially agrees with that established by the two earliest printed editions of *Epigrammes and Elegies by I.D. and C.M.* Those volumes contain 48 numbered poems, by which count – for ease of reference, and because the printed texts supply the control text for Krueger's edition – the Herriard manuscript contains poems 1-7, 10-13 and 15-36. By this print-derived numeration, Scribe B copies poem 1-7, 10-13, 15 and 20-36; Scribe C copies only poems 16-19. By its own pattern of numeration, however, the contents of the Herriard manuscript are a little harder to establish. That Scribe B knew that the poems that are 8 and 9 in the printed sequence did exist, and may or may not have omitted them deliberately, seems to be confirmed by the numeration and titling of poems 7 and 10 in the sequence: '7 In faustum' at the foot of one recto (fol. 3r) and '10 In Medontem' at the head of the immediately following verso (fol. 3v). (The two poems may of course have been omitted in the exemplar from which the Herriard manuscript was copied but, if so, that exemplar does not survive today). The apparent omission of *Epigrammes* 14, 'In Leucam' ('Leuca in presence once a fart did let') is initially easier to overlook because it occurs during a sequence in which the numeration and titling of the sequence as recorded in the Herriard manuscript goes awry. Following the correctly numbered and titled poems 10 and 11, neither of poems 12 and 13, 'In Quintum' and 'In Seueram', are given numbers alongside their titles; and the poem that then follows is, by comparison with the printed sequence, both misnumbered and mistitled. The poem that the Herriard manuscript numbers and titles '18 In faustum' ('Thou canst not speake yet macer, for to speak') is, as its first line suggests, in fact a transcript of what the printed witnesses call a six-line *Epigram* 15, 'In Macrum'. So too, poem '19 In faustum', in the Herriard sequence misnumbers the four-line text to which it belongs, *Epigram* 16, though here its title is appropriate to the poem, beginning 'That youth

sayth Faustus has a lion sene' (fol. 4r). From the point that Scribe C intervenes, with the correctly numbered and titled *Epigram* 17, the [Herriard](#) manuscript continues without disruption to its sequence, which [Scribe](#) B continues from poem 21 until the last poem transcribed, *Epigram* 36, 'Of Tobacco'.

If the inconsistencies of numeration and titling in the manuscript might well look like the errors of [Scribe B's wandering attention](#), it is less clear that the poems 'missing' from the [Herriard](#) sequence are entirely accidental absences. [Krueger's stemma](#) for the transmission of [Davies's Epigrams](#) argued for three groups of witnesses: Group I, containing [DaJ](#) 5, 6 and 8; Group II, containing [DaJ](#) 7 and 9; and Group III containing [DaJ](#) 4 and the two earliest printed editions. It is with [Krueger's Group III](#) that the [Herriard](#) manuscript most closely aligns, although in collation its idiosyncrasies are, even so, substantial. The [Herriard](#) manuscript shares a variant form of the Latin title, 'Epigrammata', with [Fitzjames's](#) manuscript ([DaJ](#) 4), and it is tempting to think that the ordering of poems in [DaJ](#) 4 – 1-8, 10, 9, 11, 13-35, 37-44, 36: see *Poems*, p.379 – might have contributed to the tangles of numeration and sequence created by [Scribes B and C](#) as described above. The [Herriard](#) manuscript is also the only manuscript besides [DaJ](#) 4 to contain a text of *Epigram* 20, 'In Gerontem', strongly suggesting that the two manuscripts derive from the same source, which [Krueger](#) argues was associated closely with [Davies](#). Such a relation might also account for the total absence of poems 37-44 if [Scribe B](#) forgot to track back to *Epigram* 37 after finishing with *Epigram* 36.

But it may be that inconsistency rather than principle offers a better explanation for some of the manuscript's uniqueness. Within poems, certainly, it is much less easy to see patterns in textual variance that might attest to something amounting to a settled policy in transcription. Take, for instance, just one example: *Epigram* 20, 'In Gerontem'. This poem is the first poem transcribed in the second transcription stint by [Scribe B](#), and palaeographically shows some of that initial,

self-conscious care over presentation and letter forms that marks the comparable start on fol. 2r: here again are the swashed h- and y-graphs, and the decorative initial A-graph. The poem is also remarkable in manuscript: as I have noted, the Herriard manuscript contains what we can identify now as only the second manuscript witness to this poem, supplementing the previously unique known witness in the Leweston Fitzjames manuscript (DaJ 4), whose strong Middle Temple associations, as will be seen below, may well bear in turn on the provenance of this manuscript.

In what follows, I offer a semi-diplomatic transcription of the poem, and a collation of its verbal variants only against the single manuscript and two substantive sixteenth-century printed texts (STC 6350.5 and STC 6350) that together comprise the textual witnesses of Krueger's Group III.¹⁹ I have excluded from this collation four later printed texts of Davies's *Epigrams*, which STC dates to the seventeenth century: STC 18931 and 18931a (both after 1602), STC 18932 (c.1630) and STC 18933 (c.1640). These witnesses were not collated by Krueger, and their linear relationship as sequential reprints was firmly established by Fredson Bowers in an article published in 1972, who seems to have been working independently on the same topic as Gill and Krueger, whose account of the same texts had been published in 1971.²⁰

20 In Gerontem

Geron whose mouldy memory
 old holinshead & famous cronicler
 which morrall rules and policy collets
 out of all actions done this fowrscore yeare

Accounts the tyme of euery odd event

5

not from christs birth nor by the princes raigne

but from some other famouse *accidente*
which in mens generall notice dothe remayne

The seige of Bulloigne, and the plagie sweate
the goinge to *Saint* Quintines, and newhaven 10
the rising in the north, the frost of great
that cartwheele prints on Thames face was graven

The fall of money & burning of Powles steeple
the blasinge starr & Spanniards ouer throwne
by these euentis notorious to *the* people 15
hee measures tyme and things forpast dothe shoe

But most of all the counts and recons by
a *pr̄uate* chaunce, the death of his curst wife
this is to him of deerest memory
and happiest accident of all his life

Title: 20 In Gerontem] 20. In Gerontem *DaJ* 4; In Gerontem 20 6350.5; In Gerontem. 20 6350

1 whose] *DaJ* 4, 6350; ^ 6350.5

memory] memory corrects *DaJ* 4; memorie corrects 6350.5, 6350

2 &] our *DaJ* 4, 6350.5, 6350

3 *which*] *DaJ* 4; With 6350.5, 6350

collets] collects *DaJ* 4, 6350.5, 6350

4 this] 6350; these *DaJ* 4; *thiese* 6350.5

yeare] 6350.5, 6350; yeares *DaJ* 4

5 tyme] *DaJ* 4, 6350.5; times 6350

odd] *DaJ* 4, 6350; olde 6350.5

6 by] *DaJ* 4; from 6350.5, 6350

11 of] so *DaJ* 4, 6350.5, 6350.5

12 was graven] were graven *DaJ* 4; were seene 6350.5, 6350

14 ouer throwne] ouerthrow *DaJ* 4, 6350.5, 6350

16 tyme] *DaJ* 4; times 6350.5, 6350

17 the counts and] he counts and *DaJ* 4; he chieflie 6350.5, he chiefly 6350

19 of] *DaJ* 4; the 6350.5, 6350

20 happiest] th'happiest *DaJ* 4, 6350.5, 6350

Collation, in this case, reveals some striking agreements between the two manuscript witnesses, and some unique oddities. It is clear, from the combination of its error in line 1, and its variant reading in line 12, that the Herriard manuscript cannot have been derived from either of the printed editions. In the format of the poem's title, and in the variants recorded in lines 3, 6, 12, 16, 17 and 19, the Herriard manuscript aligns strongly with the readings of *DaJ* 4 against the readings of the two printed texts. Those alignments are in a way smudged, however: the two manuscripts disagree in verbal number, 'was'/'were', in line 12, while agreeing in the much more difficult reading 'graven' over the 'seene' of the printed texts, which completes a rhyme that both printed texts botch. A basic transcription error appears to have turned the reading at l.17, 'he counts and', in *DaJ* 4 and the witness it was copied from into 'the counts and' in the Herriard manuscript. Such a consistency of inconsistency can be seen at large through the manuscript, which records a number of unique variants to the text of Davies's *Epigrams*, collated here against Krueger's critical text:

6.6 this] the
 15.3 wayes] noyse
 21.1 Mines] Mins
 23.7 cape] cap
 28.2 kinge] knight
 31.5 This...so to be] 'Tis...to be so
 32.7 But he hath] But hath
 36.7 wrinde] wounde
 36.18 expering] appearing
 36.20 *That*...doth stoppeth] The...doth stop
 36.27 expounded] propounded
 36.28 gentlemanly] gentleman-like
 36.31 gaine] coyne

At least two of these variants, at 28.2 and 36.27, might result from two scribes independently expanding common abbreviations in different directions. But if it is clear from these and other variants that the authority of the Herriard manuscript as a textual witness is spotty at best, its value as a witness to the pressures under which Davies's sequence was transmitted may be considerable.

The apparent disruptions to the sequence of poems in the Herriard manuscript may well be related to apparent disruptions within the texts of the poems themselves, for it is evident that some of the poems present in the manuscript are marked by omissions. The final line of Epigram 3, 'A common seate that loves a common whoore' (3.14), has not been transcribed, spoiling the rhyme and the sonnet's final couplet; and the final three lines of Epigram 36 are also absent, so that the poem, which had consistently been set out in quatrains in this transcript, ends

with a single line, unpunctuated, but (in fact) grammatically complete. The lines not transcribed might at first seem unexceptionable:

I would but say, that it the pox wil cure:

This were inough, without discoursing more,

All our brave gallants in the towne t'alure. (36.34-6; *Poems*, p.145)

But it may be that read in connection with the other line omitted from Epigram 3, and the poems omitted altogether from this transcript, that it testifies to a kind of reserve or squeamishness on the part of the transcriber(s), or the commissioner of this transcript. Epigram 8, 'In Katam', turns on a genital pun: Kate's wish 'that her pleasure coulde, | Indure as long as a buffe jerkin would'; Epigram 9, in turn, relays Liber's 'vaunt' to have 'foure onely swivde, | A maide, a wife, a widow and a whoore' ('Then Liber thou hast swivde all women kinde,' the persona replies, 'For a fift sort I know thou canst not finde').²¹ Epigram 14 concerns not sexuality but digestion – 'Leuca in presence once a fart did let' (14.1) – but the embarrassments it records ('And when she would have said, this is my glove, | My fart (quoth she)': 14.5-6) may similarly point to the reason for its exclusion from the Herriard manuscript: [the omission of](#) whoring in two poems, the pox in one and a fart in another altogether could imply a self-censoring, or at least censorious, transcriber. Yet as a rhyme-word, 'whores', is transcribed without a tremor in Epigram 17, 'In Cosmum' (17.7), and again in the first line of the epigrammatic couplet that closes Epigram 23, 'In Cineam': 'You keep a whore at your own charge men tel me, | Indeed friend (Cineas) therein you excell me' (23.1-2).

In such readings, it may seem that consistency of textual agreement is puzzlingly hard to separate out from inconsistency in transcriptional (mal)practice, the [Herriard](#) manuscript behaving like a poor witness to a document nonetheless encountered in a circumstance of privileged access. [But](#)

in sum, it is clear that the [Herriard manuscript](#) extends again our knowledge of the early modern transmission of Davies's *Epigrams*. It is the only manuscript of the *Epigrams* surviving today as an independent booklet, rather than as text entered into a larger paperbook or [subsequently bound into a larger miscellany](#), and its textual details place it very close indeed to texts known to have an association with Davies himself, even if (frustratingly) its transcribers at times muffle or occlude that proximity. But how might it relate to other materials in the Jervoise family archive, and so to other layers of social and geographical transmission in early modern writing? What might these tell us about the manuscript's first contexts?

III

Recording the [Herriard manuscript](#) as DaJ 8.5 in *CELM*, Peter Beal suggested that it was likely to derive from the papers of Sir Thomas Jervoise (1587-1654). I want to suggest here that for a number of reasons Sir Richard Paulet (c.1558-1614) is a likelier candidate to have been the first owner or sponsor of the *Epigrams* manuscript. The collection history of the manuscript [forms a strong element of the evidence](#) for this argument. [The Herriard manuscript is now](#) part of the collections passed to HRO in 1969 by the Jervoise family of Herriard, some 20 miles distant from Winchester. As the cancelled classmark on fol. 1r confirms, this manuscript was formerly in the Z-class, used to contain miscellaneous documents that were not obviously related to any individual, or to any separate class of records in the larger collection; the second M in the present slash-line now records a permanently miscellaneous place in the revised collection hierarchy.

There are nonetheless biographical reasons for thinking that Richard Paulet might have had good reason to be interested in Davies, and rather better reasons than those we might attribute to the much younger Sir Thomas Jervoise (1587-1654), Paulet's ward and subsequently son-in-law.²²

Jervoise's father, Thomas Jervys, was a member of the Middle Temple, but died on 27 December 1587, when his son was less than a year old.²³ Orphaned in infancy, Sir Thomas Jervoise was educated privately in Hampshire by James Sambourne, a puritan divine, through whom (his biographers suggest) may have begun his association with the Paulet family, formalised in 1601, when, after a suit in the Court of Wards, his wardship was transferred to Sir Richard Paulet away from his stepfather, George Wrottesley.²⁴ Firmly discounted by mortality on the one hand and by age on the other, neither Jervys nor Jervoise seems very likely to be associated in its first contexts with a manuscript containing poems whose newness in manuscript, if not whose notoriety, were very much of the metropolitan mid-1590s. But the presence of a manuscript first associated with Sir Richard Paulet in the papers of the Jervoise family does make sense, for when Paulet's wife and daughter died very shortly after his own death in July 1614, his whole estate, evidently including his archive, passed to Sir Thomas, with whose family's papers eventually it was deposited at HRO.²⁵

For other reasons, too, Sir Richard Paulet matches much better this manuscript than any other candidate. John Davies was baptised in 1569, and so was a decade or so younger than Richard Paulet, but both men shared a Hampshire geography for parts of their youth, where Paulet was born and where Davies attended Winchester College.²⁶ Both men shared an education, moving from the New Inn to become members of the Middle Temple in London, to which Paulet was admitted in October 1579 and Davies in February 1588.²⁷ Both men, too, were professional members of the Inn, whose training there in basic legal knowledge directly shaped their subsequent careers. Paulet is little present in the printed records of Middle Temple, but Davies's career, much more fully recorded in its inglorious detail, would very probably have brought him to the notice of more established members of the legal community.²⁸ It has been in a way hard to see clearly Davies's early career at the Inn past the incident in February 1598, when he beat Richard Martyn so hard that his bastinado broke (he was readmitted in October 1601), or around

John Manningham's description, picked up either from Benjamin Rudyerd or Thomas Overbury in April 1603, of Davies 'wadling with his arse out behinde as though he were about to make every one that he meetes a wall to pisse against'.²⁹ But Davies did have an earlier prominence at the Middle Temple: one of a crowd of 29 members fined for non-attendance over the Christmas vacations of 1589, he was more visible still in the record of the Candlemas celebrations both in 1590 and 1591, when on the first occasion he with others was fined £20 for having broken the Inn's ordinance 'by making outcries, forcibly breaking open chambers in the night and levying money as the Lord of Misrule's rent', a more serious offence in 1591 for being repeated.³⁰ Something of the in-and-out pattern of Davies's later career may be visible in these early records of his time at Middle Temple: in May 1591 he had 20s. 'redelivered' to him of his earlier fine, and in May 1592 he was readmitted to commons at a time when his colleague, Robert Jacob, was still refusing to 'reveal those whom he knew to be of the disordered company on Candlemas night last'.³¹ Regularly involved as a sponsor to the admission of new members through the early-1590s – John Hawker, Isaac Barrow, Christopher Frothingham, John Hoskins and Robert Morton among them – Davies was 'called to the degree of the Utter Bar' in July 1595.³²

One might well imagine the circumstances in which Davies's verse circulated, even if only as an adjunct to personality and behaviour, in the middle of the decade among members of the Middle Temple community. Leweston Fitzjames was admitted to the Middle Temple in November 1594 where he was bound with James Hannam and Henry Martyn; as Krueger has demonstrated, he quickly acquired copies of Davies's *Orchestra*, *Epigrams* and his *Epithalamion* and entered them, the last two transcripts dated 1595, into what has remained to this point our primary witness to the poems as they circulated among Davies's immediate institutional circle.³³ If at first Richard Paulet may appear less likely to have a direct textual association with Davies, it may be that his later puritan sympathies, evident in Paulet's Jacobean career, have in some measure obscured the evidence of his privileged literary interests from the 1580s at least until the turn of the century.³⁴

In the mid-1580s it appears that he had probably hosted a ‘Masque of Frenchmen’ at Herriard Park, initiated by the verse letter to him which now survives as HRO 44M69/F2/13/6, and is docketed ‘The Maskers *lettre* | 1586’.³⁵ One of his autograph draft letters, dated 5 March 1598, bears on its reverse a two-line rhyming poesy, apparently unconnected in topic with the letter, which concerns cuttings for his garden : ‘I hope my Love is ferme & myne is true | Ile lose my life before I chang for anye neewe’ (HRO 44M69/F2/12/3). Further substantial evidence of such a literary interest is a sequence of manuscripts that together contain fragmentary drafts amounting to just under 6,500-words of a prose romance, probably of the mid- to late-1590s (HRO 44M69/M4/13/3-5).³⁶ It is also likely that the pair of answer poems transcribed on a single, folded and partly damaged sheet of paper (now HRO 44M69/M4/14/1), may have an association with Paulet. The two poems, better known for their appearance as ‘Corydon’s Farewell to Phyllis’ in Robert Jones’s *First Booke of Songes and Ayres* (1600) and, perhaps from that source, for their caterwauling rendition by Feste and Sir Toby Belch in *Twelfth Night*, 2.3, are transcribed in a set secretary hand, not obviously related to those in the *Epigrams* manuscript; a cursive annotation in the margin of the recto, is in a second hand, but has now faded to illegibility. Manningham’s record of a performance of *Twelfth Night* at the Middle Temple in February 1601 provides another suggestive gloss to the two poems and their presence through Paulet and through this manuscript in the Jervoise papers. Later on, Paulet’s Jacobean experience in London has been well described by Pauline Croft who brings out the rich mix of political, social, religious and cultural activities in which he participated.³⁷ Nevertheless, one might imagine a counter-suggestible scenario in which a reader with literary interests, dreading to see what the younger generation had got up to this time, found out, and, with the collusion of his copyists, omitted the worst of it.

The palaeographical evidence for associating the main scribes of the Herriard manuscript with the household or associates of Richard Paulet is suggestive rather than conclusive. Direct

matches for Hands B and C, the copyists of the manuscript, do not unequivocally occur in the Jervoise family archives: they are not present (for instance) in the four large gatherings of legal papers relating to three cases of the period 1594-96 (now HRO 44M69/F2/14/7-10). Their only trace, indeed, may be the three words in a square hand very like Hand B's secretary script that occur as an abbreviated and perhaps incomplete docketing note, 'To the right', at the bottom left hand corner of 44M69/F2/12/2, a draft letter in Richard Paulet's set and formal hand, endorsed in italic on its verso, 'The 1 Copye of my *lettre* to | my lo: Treasurer 3 december | 1593', sent to William Cecil, Lord Burghley (see Figure 4).³⁸ As Peter Beal notes, dockets were usually added before filing by a secretary; Christopher Burlinson and Andrew Zurcher, who call this kind of annotation an addressee note, note that they are usually added either by the letter's author or by 'the secretary who prepared the letter'.³⁹ Scribe A's hand looks at some moments very temptingly (and perhaps too temptingly) like Paulet's own: compare the spurred a-graph and the terminal d-graphs in line 2 of Figure 4 ('advertised'; 'hadd as'). Even so, the sample in the Herriard manuscript is so small that firm identification is impossible. An association between the Herriard manuscript, Paulet and his more or less formal secretariat, who might naturally have been drawn from the students at Middle Temple, is nonetheless tempting. If the various errors of omission and commission that are witnessed in the *Epigrams* manuscript are very unlikely to have been made by a professional scribe, however unfamiliar with the conventions of manuscript verse, they might well be attributable to a secretary, acting here in a more or less unofficial capacity.

Even if a match for the hand were found, the identification of individual early modern hands with identifiable early modern individuals often proves so difficult that even the most detailed palaeographical investigations, as Steven W. May has argued, may aspire only to 'a high degree of probability'.⁴⁰ Material differences of pen, ink and paper, as well as differences across time, and often in the nature of the document being transcribed can all, singly and together, contribute to

high levels of variance even within the hand(s) of identified single scribes – and with such small samples as the documents discussed here that difficulty level only rises. More work on Paulet's habits in manuscript remains to be done, for those habits certainly were enduring. Paulet in the 1610s purchased writing tables, a good deal of paper and pens, and a 'trunckbox' in which to store them: Eric Nils Lindquist's forthcoming edition of Paulet's parliamentary diary from 1610 (44M69/F2/15/1), and the information that diary contains about Paulet's later manuscript habits, together offer to cast valuable light on this enquiry.

IV

Where might, then, another 'new' Davies manuscript leave us today, and what directions might it point for the future? Firstly, the textual and contextual details of the Herriard manuscript mark it as a primary point of reference for any future reconsideration of Davies's *Epigrams*. The manuscript is a witness to the earliest phase of the poems' transmission in manuscript at the Inns of Court and the many overlapping textual communities that radiate out from them.⁴¹ As a single-text booklet, HRO 44M69/M4/4 shares a format with the contemporary manuscript 'books' of Donne's *Satires*, *The Storme* and *The Calme* (for example DnJ Δ 31-4, 40), also known to have been circulating around the Inns of Court in the mid-1590s. The poetic pen trials in the manuscript remind us, too, that texts were transmitted in the early modern period not alone but often in company with others, whether within the bounds of a single manuscript or a different unit of organisation, be it the collection of an individual or a household or a still larger institution. In such a way, the new *Epigrams* manuscript requires us to look again at the transmissional networks through which Davies's texts moved. Like the much later manuscript of Davies's entertainment text, 'A contention betwixt a wife, a widow, and a Maid', now in manuscript at Birmingham as Cadbury Research Library MS 421 (DaJ 287, though recorded under an older call number), such an investigation may well suggest unexpected connections.

The compressed and re-organised text of Davies's poem in MS 421, as I have argued elsewhere, tightens the body of the poem's three-way exchanges through omission and recasts its ending through transposition; at least as late as the 1630s, and by virtue of eyeskip errors clearly derived from an intermediate witness now apparently lost, this manuscript represents a third path of transmission beyond the two already described by Krueger, for which any future stemma will need to account.⁴²

Putting the new manuscript of Davies's *Epigrams* back into contact with other kinds of writing – in other verse genres, in entertainments and their cultures, and in the varied discursive fields of imaginative and administrative prose – is an important reminder of the full, varied extent of Davies's own career.⁴³ Davies can be a contradictory poet, in the range of his writings embodying something of that violent oscillation that characterised his time at the Inns of Court, but as we come to know more about him our estimation of his value and his interest may well increase. Peter Beal in *CELM* lists over 40 new witnesses to the early modern circulation of Davies's writing, in poetry, for entertainments, and across the kinds of early modern prose from correspondence to political analysis, taking in legal work and antiquarian researches in their variety. Each of these texts offers an opportunity to see Davies at particular, historicisable moments in time, moving between and among interrelated networks of transmission and association, and to explore the connections between the many different modes in which his mind and his writing moved. At the same time, the later editions of Davies's *Epigrams* comprising STC 18931-18933 provide an opportunity to see the transmission of those texts through time, under the pressure of modernisation in spelling and possibly independent, if sometimes misguided, correction; they provide, too, an incentive to ask again how and why Marlowe's translations from Ovid were first printed with Davies's very different texts.

The possible recontextualisations of Davies's writing opened out by such an enquiry are social and institutional also. In his own lifetime, Davies's *experience* at the Inns of Court, though not without its tensions, was central to his professional formation; in his poems, in the persona of the satirist particularly, the possession of a specialised vocabulary is simultaneously the possession of a familiarity with a set of institutions and practices, and a habituation to the modes of behaviour that such discourses and locations require. Encountering Gallus, a soldier returned from the summer's campaign in the Low Countries, the persona of the *Epigrams* is assaulted by his talk 'of counterscarfes and casemates, | Of parapets, curteynes and Pallizadois, | Of flankers, Ravelings, gabions' (24.5-7). 'With words of my profession I replie', the poem continues: 'of foorching, vouchers, counterpleas, | Of Withernams, essoynes, and champartie' (24.10-12). Krueger's modest annotations to these passages – 'military terms' and, scarcely more helpful, 'legal terms' (*Poems*, p.385) – today extend an invitation to think again about how, where and why such words became part of Davies's writing. How, we might also ask, did his habits in manuscript, and as a practitioner of some skill in the field of early modern patronage, shape his career within the patterns of his life? His later career as a lawyer in Jacobean Ireland has not often been much in touch with his poetry, but the approach that Philip Hardie and Helen Moore have recently called 'career criticism', together with other case studies of the interactions between writing and professional advancement, all indicate that a larger account of Davies might now be available to us, remaking and reshaping his complete *Works* not only as glosses on his poems but as a contradictory whole.⁴⁴ This Davies will be worth our attention for the way in which the bibliographical map of his writings is layered over the real map of his personal and professional circulations, from the very urban Inns and epigrams to the archipelagic experience of his time in Ireland. A new edition of Davies's *Works* would offer the opportunity not only to ask but to answer these questions.

I am grateful to the Jervoise family for permission to publish this account of material held within the Jervoise of Herriard Collection, and to the staff of the Hampshire Record Office, in particular David Rymill, for their help during the preparation of this article. I am grateful, too, to Steve May for his encouragement to work on the manuscript; to Jonathan Gibson for an invitation to speak about it to the Open University Book History and Bibliography Research Seminar in 2013, and to Richard Danson Brown for conversations following my paper; and finally to Steve May (again), Hugh Adlington, Gillian Wright, *RES*'s two anonymous readers and Colin Burrow for their comments on earlier drafts.

¹ Peter Beal, *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts, 1450-1700 (CELM)* [celm2.digsum.kcl.ac.uk; accessed 27 April 2016]

² Under the proposals offered by Harold Love for 'Systematizing sigla', *English Manuscript Studies, 100-1700* (11 (2002), 217-30, the manuscript would be *Wjb4*.

³ Martin Butler, 'The Making of the Oxford *Ben Jonson*', *RES*, n.s. 62 (2011), 738-57.

⁴ Percy Simpson, 'Unprinted Epigrams of Sir John Davies', *RES*, n.s. 3 (1952), 49-50 (p.49).

⁵ Roma Gill and Robert Krueger, 'The Early Editions of Marlowe's *Elegies* and Davies's *Epigrams*: Sequence and Authority', *The Library*, ser. 5, 26 (1971), 242-49.

⁶ Simpson, 'Unprinted Epigrams', p.49.

⁷ R.F. Kennedy, 'Unprinted Epigrams by Davies', *Times Literary Supplement*, 7 August 1959, p.459.

⁸ James L. Sanderson, 'Unpublished Epigrams of Sir John Davies', *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 12 (1961), 281-82.

⁹ R.F. Kennedy, 'Another Davies Manuscript', *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 15 (1968), 180.

¹⁰ Robert Krueger, 'Sir John Davies: *Orchestra* Complete, *Epigrams*, Unpublished Poems', *RES*, n.s. 13 (1962), 17-29 and 113-24

¹¹ Robert Krueger and Kathleen Tobin Krueger, *From Bloodshed to Hope in Burundi: Our Embassy Years During Genocide* (Austin, 2007).

¹² Robert Krueger, 'Manuscript Evidence for Two Dates of Two *STC* Books: George Wilkins's *Three Miseries of Barbary* and the Third Edition of Elizabeth Grymeston's *Miscelanea*', *The Library*, ser.5 (1961), 414-42; 'Sir John Davies: *Orchestra* Complete, *Epigrams*, Unpublished Poems', *RES*, 13 (1962), 17-29, 113-24; and 'The Publication of John Donne's Sermons', *RES*, 15 (1964), 151-60.

¹³ No publication files survive in the Oxford University Press Archives to explain the long delay between between the dating of Krueger's 'Preface', '*Durham, North Carolina | 11 June 1971*' and publication of the edition in 1975 (email from Dr Martin Maw, 15 July 2013); Bush, writing anonymously, warmly reviewed the edition in the *Times Literary Supplement*, 30 April 1976.

¹⁴ [Daniel W. Mosser and Ernest W. Sullivan II](#), with Len Hatfield and David H. Radcliffe, *The Thomas L. Gravell Watermark Archive* [www.gravell.org; accessed 27 April 2016].

¹⁵ As Aaron T. Pratt has recently confirmed, 'stab-stitching was the everyday way of doing things for books across forms and genres' and here again is simply functional: 'Stab-Stitching and the Status of Early English Playbooks as Literature', *The Library*, 7th ser. 16 (2015), 304-28 (p.328).

¹⁶ Steven W. May and William A. Ringler, Jr., *Elizabethan Poetry: A Bibliography and First-Line Index of English Verse, 1559-1603*, 3 vols (London, 2004).

¹⁷ Richard A. McCabe, ed., *The Shorter Poems* (Harmondsworth, 1999), p.425.

¹⁸ [CELM](#) records evidence of four poems from *Amoretti* having circulated in manuscript in the early modern period (SpE 1-7.9), of which perhaps only three witnesses to Sonnet 8 (SpE 2, 4, 6) predate print publication in 1595.

¹⁹ Krueger, pp.378-79.

²⁰ Fredson Bowers, 'The Early Editions of Marlowe's "Ovid's Elegies"', *Studies in Bibliography*, 25 (1972), 149-72.

²¹ Krueger, pp.133-4; on the pun see Ian Donaldson, 'Falstaff's Buff Jerkin', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 37 (1986), 100-101.

²² For Paulet's biography see Virginia Moseley and Rosemary Sgroi, 'Paulet, Sir Richard (c.1558-1614)' in *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1604-1629*, ed. Andrew Thrush and John P. Ferris, 6 vols (Cambridge, 2010), 5.618-20; for his year of birth see the following note.

²³ The inquisitio post mortem for Thomas Jervys took place on 13 June 1588 (on the definition see Peter Beal, *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology, 1450-2000* (Oxford, 2008), p.206); a later copy of this document produced for Sir Thomas Jervoise in May 1612 is HRO 44M69/F4/18/1 (information from fol.18r). Three sixteenth century copies survive: in Chancery records as National Archives (NA) C 142/216/64; and in records of the Court of Wards as NA WARD 7/22/9 and NA WARD 7/22/91.

²⁴ Virginia Moseley and Rosemary Sgroi, 'Jervoise, Sir Thomas (1587-1654)' in Thrush and Ferris, eds, *The House of Commons 1604-1629*, 4.901-04.

²⁵ Thrush and Ferris, eds, *The House of Commons 1604-1629*, 5.20.

²⁶ Krueger's biography of Davies is now complemented by two more recent 'Lives', by Sean Kelsey, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008) [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7245>, accessed 27 April 2016], and by Ben Coates in Thrush and Ferris, eds, *The House of Commons 1604-1629*, 4.27-32.

²⁷ Charles Trice Martin, ed., *Minutes of Parliament of the Middle Temple*, 4 vols (London, 1904-05), 1.229, 1.296.

²⁸ As Rosalind Barber has suggested in a similar way he soon became noticed by the literary community: 'Sir John Davies as Guilpin's Fuscus', *Notes and Queries*, 62 (2015), 553-54.

²⁹ Martin, ed., *Minutes*, 1.379-80; Robert Parker Sorlien, ed., *The Diary of John Manningham of the Middle Temple, 1602-1603* (Hanover, 1976), p.235.

³⁰ Martin, ed., *Minutes*, 1.318, 1.326-27.

³¹ Martin, ed., *Minutes*, 1.320, 328.

³² Martin, ed., *Minutes*, 1.321, 1.323, 1.324, 1.333, 1.351, 1.354; I have standardised the forms of names following ODNB and other standard sources.

³³ Martin, ed., *Minutes*, 1.346; Krueger, ‘Sir John Davies’; and Krueger, ed., *Poems*, p.442.

³⁴ Thrush and Ferris, eds, *The House of Commons 1604-1629*, 5.619.

³⁵ Martin Wiggins draws on unpublished research by Peter H. Greenfield to supply a helpfully speculative account: *British Drama 1533-1642: A Catalogue, Volume II: 1567-1589* (Oxford, 2012), p.364; the poem was earlier recorded as a ‘supplicatory poem’ addressed to Paulet in May and Ringler, *Elizabethan Poetry*, EV 2898.5 and 1.161.

³⁶ I intend to write elsewhere at greater length about this fragmentary romance.

³⁷ Pauline Croft, ‘Capital Life: Members of Parliament Outside the House’ in Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust and Peter Lake, eds, *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge, 2002), pp.65-83.

³⁸ The copy received by Cecil appears not to survive; a later identically formatted autograph letter from Paulet to Cecil, dated 3 July 1600, is now Cecil Papers, Hatfield House, CP 251/113.

³⁹ On dockets, see Beal, *Dictionary*, pp.125-26; on addressee notes see Christopher Burlinson and Andrew Zurcher, “‘Secretary to the Lord Grey Lord Deputie here’: Edmund Spenser’s Irish Papers’, *The Library*, 7th ser. 6 (2005), 30-75 (p.58).

⁴⁰ Steven W. May, ‘Matching Hands: The Search for the Scribe of the “Stanhope” Manuscript’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 76 (2013), 345-75.

⁴¹ See further Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring and Sarah Knight, eds, *The Intellectual and Cultural World of the Early Modern Inns of Court* (Manchester, 2011).

⁴² Tom Lockwood, ‘For Honour and Glory: Reading Selden and Sylvester in the Seventeenth Century’, *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 41 (2012 for 2010), 119-29.

⁴³ Gabriel Heaton has explored Davies's entertainments in *Writing and Reading Royal Entertainments: From George Gascoigne to Ben Jonson* (Oxford, 2010); Patricia Palmer, *Language and Conquest in Early Modern Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001) provides useful starting points for Davies in Ireland; and Angus Vine, *In Defiance of Time: Antiquarian Writing in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2010) provides a rich context within which to situate Davies's antiquarian research without discussing him directly.

⁴⁴ Philip Hardie and Helen Moore, eds, *Classical Literary Careers and their Reception* (Cambridge, 2010); see also David Colclough, ed., *John Donne's Professional Lives* (Cambridge, 2003), and Tom Lockwood, 'Poetry, Patronage and Cultural Agency: the Career of William Lewis' in Hugh Adlington, Tom Lockwood Gillian Wright, eds, *Chaplains in Early Modern England: Literature, Patronage and Religion* (Manchester, 2013), pp.103-22.